IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.GIRI

FRIDAY, THE 7TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 16TH BHADRA 1929

WP(C).No. 26680 of 2007(A)

PETITIONER:

P.BALACHANDRAN NAIR,
AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT,
KRISHI BHAVAN, KADAVALLOOR.

BY ADV. SRI.P.RAMAKRISHNAN

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE DIRECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF AGRICULTURE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI. BIJOY CHANDRAN, GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 07/09/2007 THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

V. GIRI , J

==========

W.P.(C) NO.26680 OF 2007

==========

Dated this the 7th day of September, 2007.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is working as Agricultural Assistant at Krishi Bhavan at Kadavalloor. In the year 1997, Ext.P1 notice was issued to him requiring him to pay an amount of Rs.1,224/-, stated to be towards the shortage of 75 coconut saplings. The petitioner submitted a reply to the same. Ext.P2 order was passed by the 3rd respondent holding that the saplings was dried off as they were not sold in time. The petitioner was therefore directed to pay an amount of Rs.612/-. An appeal preferred by the petitioner as Ext.P3 was also rejected vide Ext.P5. The petitioner challenges Exts.P2 and P4.

2. Apparently, the petitioner seems to have a grievance, not with regard to the quantum of amount which he has been directed to pay, but the premise on the basis of which he has been asked to do so. The allegations originally raised seems to have been the loss of saplings and what has been found in Exts.P2 and P4 is the alleged delay in disbursing the same. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case where an honest Government servant suffers indignation for being asked to make good a loss for which he was not

in any way responsible. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and also considered the averments in the writ petition. May be the petitioner has a grievance, but the grievance is on account of the fact that the allegations originally raised is not found in Exts.P2 and P4. But the matter is one which falls within the domain of administration carried on by the officers in question. There is no ground which warrants an interference with Exts.P2 and P4. I am not inclined to interfere with the same in as much as the petitioner is not visited with any permanent detriment of substantial nature, by reason of Exts.P2 and P4. The writ petition fails and the same is dismissed.

V. GIRI, JUDGE.

rv